



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,278	05/08/2001	Thomas M. Rothwein	M-11555 US	3426
60975	7590	09/15/2006	EXAMINER PHAM, KHANH B	
CSA LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/851,278

Applicant(s)

ROTHWEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29,33-35,38-41,44-47 and 50-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29,33-35,38-41,44-47 and 50-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,10,15,20 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 16, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Objections

1. **Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25** are objected to because of the following informalities:
- Claim 5, lines 3 and 5: "**fourth** class" should be replaced with "**third** class";
 - Claims 10, 15, 20, 25 are also objected by the same reason.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-29,33-35,38-41,44-47,50-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gottlob et al. ("Extending Object-Oriented Systems with Roles"), hereinafter referred to as "**Gottlob**".

As per claim 1, Gottlob teaches a method of arranging a plurality of objects, said method comprising:

- “setting a class hierarchy, wherein the class hierarchy comprises an upper level class and a lower level class” at page 273, Fig. 1;
- “assigning a first attribute to the upper level class, wherein the first attribute describes each object of the plurality of objects” at page 274, Figs. 2-3;
- “inheriting of the first attribute by the lower level class, wherein the first attribute is within a first domain with regard to the upper level class, the first attribute is within a second domain with regard to the lower level class, a second domain value set of the second domain is smaller than a first domain value set of the first domain” at page 270, 1st full paragraph and Figs. 2-3;
- “the first attribute is restricted to the second domain value set upon the inheriting” at page 270, 1st full paragraph and Figs. 2-3;
- “assigning a second attribute to the lower level class, wherein the second attribute describes each object of the plurality of objects associated with the lower level class” at page 274, Figs. 2-3
- “associating an object of the plurality of objects with a chosen class, wherein the chosen class is one of the upper level class and the lower level class” at Fig. 2;
- “the chosen class is chosen such that, for the object, every attribute assigned to the chosen class has a non-null value used to described the object” at page 273, 2nd paragraph and Figs. 2-3;

- "said method is performed by a processor configured to perform said method" at page 268, abstract.

As per claim 2, Gottlob teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: "superseding said first attribute of said upper level class by assigning a third attribute to the lower level class, wherein the third attribute describing an object that is a member of the lower level class" at Figs. 1-3.

As per claim 3, Gottlob teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the first attribute comprises a distinctive domain value set" at Figs. 1-3.

As per claim 4, Gottlob teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the class hierarchy further comprises a third class below the lower level class in the class hierarchy, and further comprising: inheriting of the attribute by the class" at page 273 and Figs. 1-3.

As per claim 5, Gottlob teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: "expanding the class hierarchy horizontally by adding a fourth class to the lower level class; and inheriting of the first attribute by the class" at Fig. 1.

Claims 6-29,33-35,38-41,44-47,50-53 recite similar limitations as in claims 1-5 and therefore rejected by the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims **1-29,33-35,38-41,44-47,50-53** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3574** for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/851,278
Art Unit: 2166

Page 6

Khanh B. Pham
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

September 11, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kpham", written in a cursive style.